

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed January 1, 2006.

### **Title Objections**

The title of the application is objected and the Office Action suggests using one that is more descriptive of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The title adequately describes the claimed embodiment, which is a technique for sharing registers across threads. Therefore, Applicant declines to change the title.

### **Drawings**

Figure 3 is objected to for having the feature, "wireless interface", without being referred to in the spec and being labeled with the same reference number as another feature in the drawing. Accordingly, correct Figure 3 is filed herewith, wherein the feature labeled "wireless interface" is removed. Therefore, the rejection is overcome.

### **Specification**

The specification is objected to, because of various grammatical errors. A revised specification is filed herewith in which the cited mistakes are corrected. Therefore, the objection is overcome.

### **35 USC 112 Rejections**

Claims 14 and 29 are rejected for reciting that the sum of the freelist registers and those being used are equal to the total number of physical registers. Claims 14 and 29 are amended to reflect that this is during multi-threaded mode. Accordingly the rejection is overcome.

### **35 USC 101 Rejections**

Claims 14 and 29 are rejected for reciting that the sum of the freelist registers and those being used are equal to the total number of physical registers. Claims 14 and 29 are amended to reflect that this is during multi-threaded mode. Accordingly the rejection is overcome.

### **35 USC §102(b)**

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Levy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,092,175). Particularly, independent claims 1, 8, and 16 are alleged to be anticipated by Levy, because Levy is alleged to have taught storing data in a physical register in an order that's independent of whether a processor is in single thread or multi-thread mode. Although, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action's characterization of Levy, as it relates to the pending claims, Applicant has nonetheless amended claims 1, 8, and 16 to more clearly articulate at least one aspect of one embodiment that is clearly not taught by Levy.

Particularly, Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, and 16 to reflect that the physical register file is to be equally allocated to multiple threads when in multi-thread mode. Levy, on the other hand, as the Office Action points out, allocates registers to

various threads based on whether the registers are available without regard to how many registers are allocated to each thread. In this manner, Levy allocates physical registers to multiple threads on a "first-come-first-serve" basis, whereas claims 1, 8, and 16 as presently amended recite that the registers are allocated equally to multiple threads. Therefore, claims 1, 8, and 16 as presently amended are not anticipated by Levy and the rejection is overcome.

As for claim 23, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action's characterization of Levy as it pertains to claim 23. Particularly, Levy does not teach dividing a freelist of registers in half, as in claim 23. Therefore, Levy does not anticipate claim 23.

It is respectfully asserted by Applicant that all presently standing claims are now in condition for allowance. Please charge any fees not covered by any checks submitted herewith to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFAM LLP

Dated: June 30, 2006

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael J. Mallie  
Reg. No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030  
(408) 720-8300